

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on December 5, 2008.

Claims 1, 26, and 33 are amended; claims 8-25 were previously canceled, without prejudice to the Applicant; as a result, claims 1-7 and 26-38 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the claimed amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 6 lines 6-19; page 10 line 31 to page 11 line 3; and page 14 lines 3-8.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-7 and 26-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Quine et al. (U.S. 2003/0115280) in views of Sheldon et al. (U.S. 2002/0169840). To sustain an obviousness rejection, each and every element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

Applicant would like to respectfully point out that the independent claims recite the following elements: "selecting one or more additional domain names in addition to the preferred domain name;" "assigning multiple domains with an electronic mail (email) definition;" and "defining a plurality of domains for an electronic mail (email)." The Examiner has acknowledge this fact and has stated as much on page 4 and page 7 stating that "Quine does not teach selecting one or more additional domain names in addition to the preferred address format, and retaining the one or more additional domain names."

To supply these teachings, which are positively recited in the rejected claims, the Examiner has recited Sheldon paragraphs 44 and 122. The Examiner states that Sheldon 'teaches users can dynamically create multiple e-mail addresses by adding suffix to the root email address (suffix, username@domainname.com and username@domainname.com) . . ."

Sheldon does speak to blocking received emails that a user receives at his/her email addresses where those received emails are from specific domains and does speak to permitting received emails at the user's email addresses that are from other specific domains. However, by the Examiner's own statement and by a full reading of Sheldon, Sheldon does not allow multiple domains to be associated with the email address of the user. That is, just one domain is

presented in Sheldon for a user's email address. There are multiple prefixes, which Sheldon discusses as being a "suffix." But, clearly there is no ability to assign multiple "domains" to the user email address to define that email address. Moreover, the claims state that the multiple domains are used to define an email address and the email address is used to uniquely identify a resource and route and deliver messages to the resource over the Internet. So, there can be no doubt that domain names belong to the email address of the resource, such is not the case in Sheldon.

Thus, the proposed combination lacks the above-cited claim elements and as such cannot be used to render Applicant's claimed invention obvious. Correspondingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims of record be allowed.

Moreover, there is no discussion whatsoever in the proposed combination where a domain that represents the multiple available domains, and which all define an email, is acquired as attributes from a directory by a directory service via inheritance from a parent node within the directory. These elements are also now recited in the amended independent claims.

Accordingly, for this reason as well the rejections of record should be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 03-05-09

By /  /

Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535